

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)  
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/583301-Conf. #2275	
	Filing Date	May 30, 2000	
	First Named Inventor	Robert Seliger	
	Art Unit	2157	
	Examiner Name	L. T. Jacobs	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	3	Attorney Docket Number	S1389.70009US00

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form  <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached  <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply  <input type="checkbox"/> After Final  <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)  <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request  <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request  <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement  <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)  <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application  <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)  <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers  <input type="checkbox"/> Petition  <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application  <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address  <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer  <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund  <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____  <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC  <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences  <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)  <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information  <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):  Return Receipt Postcard Comments on The Examiner's Interview Summary
<div>Remarks</div>		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm Name	WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.		
Signature			
Printed name	Richard F. Giunta		
Date	August 22, 2006	Reg. No.	36,149

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8(a)	
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.	
Dated: 8/22/06	Signature:  (Richard F. Giunta)



DOCKET NO: S1389.70009US00

AF  
JFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Robert Seliger  
Serial No: 09/583,301  
Confirmation No: 2275  
Filed: May 30, 2000  
For: CONTEXT MANAGEMENT SERVER APPLIANCE  
Examiner: Jacobs, Lashonda T.  
Art Unit: 2157

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of August 2006..

Richard F. Giunta, Reg. No. 36,149

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**COMMENT ON THE EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Sir:


In an Interview Summary mailed August 10, 2006, the Examiner summarized the telephone interview of July 28, 2006. Applicant provided a detailed summary of that interview in the Request for Reconsideration filed on August 2, 2006. If the Examiner disagrees with any of the discussion of the interview provided therein, she is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below to discuss how the record can be clarified.

The interview summary indicates that a discussion was had of the differences between the prior art and claim 48, and that the Examiner "agreed that the Besaw reference has one user sharing a context information instead of multiple users sharing context." To ensure that the record is clear, the point Applicant made about Besaw being directed to one user sharing context instead of multiple users relates to the non combinability argument presented during the interview and memorialized in the Request for Reconsideration relating to the differences between Besaw and Seliger. Applicant did not argue that claim 48 distinguishes over Besaw

because Besaw is limited to one user sharing context information, and Applicant has filed this paper to make sure that the record is clear in that respect.

. If the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing, she is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below to discuss how the record can be clarified.

Respectfully submitted,  
***Robert Seliger, Applicant,***



---

Richard F. Giunta, Reg. No. 36,149  
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210  
Tel. (617) 646-8000

Docket No. S1389.70009US00  
Date: August 22, 2006  
**NDD**